

Interview Summary	Application No. 08/468,610	Applicant(s) Burton et al.
	Examiner Jon P. Weber, Ph.D.	Group Art Unit 1808
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) <u>Jon P. Weber, Ph.D.</u>	(3) <u>Landon Steele</u>	
(2) <u>Jerry Swiss</u>	(4) _____	
Date of Interview <u>1 Feb 1996</u>		
Type: <input type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Personal (copy is given to <input type="checkbox"/> applicant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> applicant's representative).		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No. If yes, brief description:		
<p>Agreement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> was reached. <input type="checkbox"/> was not reached.</p> <p>Claim(s) discussed: <u>All active</u></p> <p>Identification of prior art discussed: <u>All especially Sasaki et al.</u></p> <p>Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>Claims are directed to a resin protien complex having ionizable functionality on the resin but wherin the resin is uncharged in the complex.</u></p> <p><u>Sasaki et al. appear to have the basic concept of the claimed resin, but did not appreciate the generality thereof, only presents Amberlite resin and pH values less than 4.5. In addition Sasaki et al. appears to have errors in the data interpretation. Kasche et al. appears to have charge on the resin at the pH of absorbtion. The other references do not appear to appreciate the concept of the claimed invention or are irrelevant.</u></p> <p><u>Applicants will consider amending the claims to set a minimum pH of about 5 for the absorbtion.</u></p> <p>(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview. Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. <input type="checkbox"/> Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked. <p>Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.</p>		